

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

2
3
4
5
6

## 8

9
10
11
12

13
14
15
16
17
18

## 20

21
22
23
24

1        **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

2        **Claims 16-17, 25-27, 45-47, 49-50, 52-54, 63, 65, and 67** stand rejected  
3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692 to  
4 Theimer et al. (hereinafter, "Theimer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,913 to  
5 Christ (hereinafter, "Christ"). The Office states in its summary that claim 66 is  
6 rejected over Theimer in view of Christ but in its argument relies on U.S. Patent  
7 No. 5,659,596 to Dunn (hereinafter, "Dunn").

8        **Claim 51** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable  
9 over Theimer in view Christ and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,781,150 to  
10 Norris (hereinafter, "Norris").

11        **Claims 18, 48, and 66** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being  
12 unpatentable over Theimer in view Christ and further in view of Dunn.

13        **Claim 64** stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable  
14 over Theimer in view of Christ and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,425 to  
15 Crimmons (hereinafter, "Crimmons").

16  
17        **Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

18        First, independent claims 16, 45, and 63 each recite at least one action  
19 performed by a mobile computing unit other than simply transmitting a signal. But  
20 Christ and Theimer teach mobile devices that do little more than transmit signals.  
21 For example, Christ discloses a "walkie-talkie" that transmits a signal whereby a  
22 "central mapping computer" can locate a user. Theimer discloses tabs, pads, and  
23 active badges that transmit information used by stationary components to locate  
24 and identify a user. Christ's and Theimer's mobile devices simply do not perform  
25 like the claimed mobile computing units.

1 Second, the Office improperly combines Christ and Theimer as submitted in  
2 a prior Response dated October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2005, from page 24, line 15, to page 31, line  
3 22, which is herein incorporated by reference.

4 For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office fails to  
5 establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting the subject matter of  
6 independent claims 16, 45, and 63.

7 **Claims 17, 18, and 25-27; 46-54; and 64-67** depend from independent  
8 claims 16, 45, and 63, respectively, and are allowable as depending from an  
9 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
10 features that, in combination with those recited in their base claim, are neither  
11 disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination  
12 with one another.

13  
14 **Conclusion**

15 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present  
16 application. Should any issue remain that prevents prompt issuance of the  
17 application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to  
18 discuss the unresolved issue.

19  
20 Respectfully Submitted,

21  
22 Date: 13 JAN 06

23 By: Michael K. Colby  
24 Michael K. Colby  
25 Reg. No. 45,816